

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-4 were pending and under consideration.

In the office action of February 9, 2006, claims 1-4 were rejected as anticipated by the admitted prior art. A requirement to add a legend such as "Prior Art" to Figures 5a-5c was also made.

In response, the figures have been amended as requested, the specification has been amended to clarify the disclosure as reflected in the figures, and the claims have been amended to make clearer the distinguishing feature of the invention. No new matter has been added, as the figures clearly illustrate this difference.

Regarding all of the claims, the present invention is distinguished from the prior art by having at least one lead with a wire bonding pad having a portion or area exposed on one side to one device or mounting surface and another portion or area exposed on another side to another device or mounting surface, where the exposed portions are not coincident. This enables one to wire bond a device to the one exposed portion or area and wire bond another device to the other, oppositely facing exposed portion or area. Yet the lead can be held in place by the coverings over the unexposed portions, and the exposed portions are supported by the covering portions on the opposite side.

In the admitted prior art, there simply are no such non-coincident exposed portions of a pad. Indeed, it is specifically noted that:

[0009] Also, as another means, for example, as shown in FIG. 8A to FIG. 8C, the pad portion 55B of the lead 55 is considered to be exposed to both of the one surface side and the other surface side of the housing 51. Specifically, a thin-walled portion is formed inside the housing 51, and the pad portion 55B of the lead 55 is exposed to this thin-walled portion. However, in this case, at the time of the executing the wire bonding, when a capillary is used to apply a force to the pad portion 55B of the lead 55, the pad portion 55B is pushed by this pressing force and stripped off from the thin-walled portion of the housing 51. Thus, another problem is induced.

Clearly the exposed portions are not supported on the opposite of the pad portion.

Otherwise this push through problem would not exist.

Regarding claim 3, this claim has been amended to specifically recite the wire bonding to both of the non-coincident exposed areas of the pad portion of the at least one lead. This is a feature that does not exists with thin leads as the ability to selectively expose the pad portion surfaces diminishes with diminishing width of the pad portion.

Regarding new claim 5, this claim has been added to recite the larger width of the at least one lead relative to the other leads.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3 and 5 are patentable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/David R. Metzger/ (Reg. No. 32,919)

David R. Metzger
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Telephone (312) 876 8000
Customer No. 26263